REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks Examiner for the detailed Office Action dated February 8, 2008. In response to the issues raised, the Applicant offers the following submissions and amendments.

Amendments

Claim 2 has been amended to correct the typographical error identified by the Examiner.

35 U.S.C. §103 - Claims 1 and 4

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected as obvious in light of US 6,557,967 to McElfresh et al.

Claim 1 is restricted to "a first electrical connector in electrical communication with said printhead and disposed adjacent a first end of the elongate array of nozzles of the pagewidth printhead for mating with a first corresponding connector of the inkjet printer; wherein during use, the first electrical connector engages the first corresponding connector with a contact force that is parallel to the longitudinal extent of the elongate array of nozzles such that a longitudinally compressive force acts on the printer cartridge when it is installed in the printer".

Similarly, claim 4 is limited to "first and second electrical connectors in electrical communication with said printhead, said first and second connectors attached to the elongate body and disposed adjacent opposite ends of the pagewidth printhead for mating with corresponding first and second electrical connectors of the inkjet printer; wherein during use, the first and second electrical connectors engage the corresponding first and second electrical connectors of the inkjet printer with a contact force that is parallel to the longitudinal extent of the elongate body such that a longitudinally compressive force acts on the printer cartridge when it is installed in the printer".

The Examiner argues that these elements of the claims involve a mere rearrangement of parts and therefore do not define an invention. To support this rationale, the Examiner cites the decision in *re Japikse*, 181 F.2d 1019, 86 USPQ 70 (CCPA 1950). Applicant respectfully submits that the facts of *Japikse* are distinguished from the present invention. The *Japikse* decision applies to repositioning elements of a device without any resultant modification of the operation. This is plainly not the case with the present invention.

By positioning the electrical contacts at an end of the pagewidth printhead, the force needed to maintain the electrical connection is directed down the longitudinal axis of the printhead. Placing the contacts on the side of the printhead would direct the contact force laterally and tend to bow and deflect the printhead. The structural rigidity needed to keep deflection to an acceptable minimum requires the printhead to have a certain thickness and or the use of stiffer materials. This adds to the overall size and cost of the printer.

In order to support a §103 rejection, it is also necessary that motivation for the claimed rearrangement is present in the cited reference. McElfresh does not provide any incentive to position the electrical contacts at the longitudinal ends of the pagewidth printhead. In fact,

it teaches away from such an arrangement. The longitudinal ends of the individual carriers 30 that support the dies 40, abut the longitudinal ends of the adjacent carriers. Placing the electrical contacts 68 at the longitudinal ends would be difficult to access. Furthermore, McElfresh has contacts engaging electrical conductors from opposing sides of each carrier. Clearly, lateral flex of the pagewidth printhead from electrical contact pad pressure is not a potential issue for this design. McElfresh would not inspire the ordinary worker to move the electrical contacts to the longitudinal ends and in fact, present compelling disincentives to do so.

In light of the above, the printer cartridge of claims 1 or 4 is not an obvious derivation of McElfresh.

Claims 1 and 4 stand rejected as obvious in light of US 6,557,967 to McElfresh et al in view of US 6,869,166 to Brugue et al.

Like McElfresh, Brugue teaches one part of a wide-array printhead. Hence the potential for flexing the pagewidth array because of lateral contact pressure does not exist. Accordingly, neither of the citations provides any teaching or motivation for a pagewidth printhead with electrical contacts at a longitudinal end.

It follows from the above, that claims 2 and 3 are likewise novel and inventive in light of the cited prior art.

Conclusion

It is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejections have been successfully traversed and the application is now in condition for allowance. Accordingly, favorable reconsideration of the application is courteously solicited.

Very respectfully,

Applicant/s: 

Kia Silverbrook

C/o: Silverbrook Research Pty Ltd
393 Darling Street
Balmain NSW 2041, Australia

Email: kia.silverbrook@silverbrookresearch.com

Telephone: +612 9818 6633

Facsimile: +61 2 9555 7762